

According to Stonov, when the Russian State Duma—the lower house of Parliament—held hearings on fascism, “[ultra-nationalist leader Vladimir] Zhirinovskiy said that the real danger to Russia came from ‘democratic fascism,’ while others spoke of the perils of ‘Masonic fascism.’ Never before in Russia—even during Czarist time—had there been such open, animal expressions of anti-Semitism during parliamentary discussions.”

Stonov was speaking to LICSIJ members who had gathered to view a screening of *Freedom To Hate* on WLIW-TV (Channel 21), together with the film’s director, Ray Errol Fox. The hour-long documentary, narrated by Dan Rather and introduced by Jack Lemmon, explores the upsurge of anti-Semitism in the former Soviet Union.

Freedom To Hate includes extensive interviews with leaders of the neo-Nazi Pamyat movement, discussions of fascism and anti-Semitism with such prominent Russians as poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko and commentator Vladimir Posner, and interviews with Russian Jews victimized by anti-Semitic violence.

Though filmed mainly in 1990 and 1991, the documentary closes with a recent scene of Zhirinovskiy delivering a menacing speech, showing that the conditions portrayed in the film still exist.

Although Stonov noted that the fear of imminent pogroms in 1990–1991 has largely abated, he said that “the situation is far more dangerous for Jews today than it was when this film was being made. In those days, it was only Pamyat . . . a relatively small organization . . . that was openly espousing anti-Semitism. Today in Russia, there are 137 open anti-Semitic newspapers being sold on the streets . . . and the influence of the anti-Semitic organization is growing rapidly.”

He added, “The danger is not only from Zhirinovskiy. There is Alexander Barkashov, who heads his own growing anti-Semitic organization with its own private army. Another prominent anti-Semite is Nikolai Lysenko, who argues that Russians should be particularly afraid of Jews who forego involvement in Jewish affairs, but instead are active in Russian politics, business and cultural life.”

Lysenko is a former Pamyat member now in the Duma. Zhirinovskiy’s Liberal-Democratic party won about 25 percent of the vote in the parliamentary elections of 1992.

Stonov said he is concerned that with the collapsing popularity of President Boris Yeltsin in the wake of the brutal war in Chechnya, the heir apparent may be former vice president Alexander Rutskoi. Rutskoi was jailed by Yeltsin in October 1993 for inciting to rebellion, but the nationalist-dominated Parliament ordered him set free in early 1994.

Stonov noted that Rutskoi, formerly considered sympathetic to Israel and Russian Jewry, has in the past several years forged close political ties with the coalition of former Communists and Russian nationalists who believe Jews are responsible for many of Russia’s ills.

Asked about Rutskoi’s declaration during a 1992 visit to Israel that his mother was Jewish, Stonov wryly noted that during a visit to Warsaw, the former vice president had also declared his mother to have been Polish. In any event, said Stonov, Rutskoi’s comments in Israel were barely mentioned in the Russian media.

Queried as to why Russian emigration to Israel has dropped to one third the level of 1990–1991 if the peril to Jews has increased, Stonov responded, “One might also ask why, after the Los Angeles earthquake, people began rebuilding their houses.

“Many of the Jews who have remained in Russia have deep psychological roots there. Others have gone into business in Russia. They don’t want to believe the situation there will end like it did in Germany. Still, with the rapid worsening of the situation, I am expecting a major new wave of emigration.”

In the wake of Yeltsin’s Chechnya misadventure and increasing movement toward the right, Stonov contended that “the political situation in Russia is dramatically changing for the worse and the West seems to be unaware of what is happening. America doesn’t seem to understand that the democratic order in Russia is again under threat.

“I think the Clinton administration should be pressing the Russian government to move faster toward a market economy,” continued Stonov. “Credits should be given to Russia only if real privatization is carried out there. When the West gives credits without privatization, all the money just ends up in Swiss bank accounts.”

While attending an anti-fascist forum during his Moscow visit, Stonov found that all the democratic leaders feel extremely threatened by what is happening. “[Human Rights Commissioner] Sergei Kovalev had very sad words. He said, ‘We Russians are ruled by scum and we are scum for allowing that to happen.’”

Noting that Yeltsin has never directly denounced anti-Semitism in Russia, Stonov said, “Anti-Semitism is flourishing as never before, in part because there are no official constraints.” He added, “If there were free elections tomorrow, the fascists would probably not win in Moscow, but they would do very well in provincial areas like the Urals, parts of Siberia, and Krasnodar in southern Russia. The political position of the fascists is very strong, and they are now in a position to stimulate a pogrom from the podium in the State Duma.”

Stonov praised *Freedom to Hate* as “a very important work that will hopefully help to get across the message of how perilous the situation of Jews in the former Soviet Union really is.”

But, he said to the LICSIJ group, he has had a hard time getting the film screened. “Many people, including prominent Jews, have accused me of exaggerating the situation.

“Despite everything that has happened recently, there is still a kind of euphoria in this country among American Jews about the situation in Russia.

“The way that I present the situation is intense,” said Fox, “but everything I show is true. I don’t know how else to show the situation in order to get the message across.”

Lynn Singer, longtime executive director of LICSIJ, remarked, “All people of good will need to redouble our efforts to get out the word about the deadly peril facing Jews in the former Soviet Union.”

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke here about the Interior conference legislation. I talked some about the issue of child abuse, particularly with respect to native Americans, and about some of the difficulties that I have witnessed and held some hearings about.

I described Tamara DeMaris, who was placed in a foster home at age 3 and severely beaten. Her nose was broken,

her arm was broken, her hair pulled out by the roots. Why? Because one person was handling 150 cases and did not have time to check where they were putting this 3-year-old kid, so this poor 3-year-old was put in an unsafe foster home where drunken brawls ensued and this child was beaten severely.

We need to do better than this. That was the point I was making yesterday. Children cannot deal for themselves. They are not responsible for themselves. We are responsible to help children in this country who are helpless, to give hope to children who are hopeless. It is our responsibility.

I read a few days ago a piece in Time magazine that I wish to read to the Senate, not in its entirety, but I would ask all of you to read the article in its entirety, because it, too, relates to the question of what are we doing to protect children in this country. I am not talking about the children that go to bed safe and secure at night in a good home, that is warm, having just had a good meal. I am talking about children who come from circumstances of poverty and neglect and abuse, and who cannot help themselves.

On the cover of Time magazine was a picture of a young girl named Elisa Izquierdo. Let me read part of the magazine article to you because it describes something we all must understand—behind all of these discussions about policies and numbers are people, some of whom are desperately reaching out for help.

“Little Elisa Izquierdo liked to dance, which is almost too perfect,” the article says, this article written by David Van Biema in the December 11 Time magazine. It says:

Fairy tales, especially those featuring princesses, often include dancing, although perhaps not Elisa’s favorite merengue. Fairy-tale princesses are born humble. Elisa fit that bill: she was conceived in a homeless shelter in the Fort Greene section of Brooklyn and born addicted to crack. That Elisa nevertheless had a special, enchanted aura is something that the whole city of New York now knows. “Radiant,” said one of her preschool teachers, remembering a brilliant smile and flashing black eyes. “People loved her,” adds another. “Everybody loved her.” And, unlikely as it may seem, there was even a prince in Elisa’s life: a real scion of Greece’s old royalty named Prince Michael, who was a patron of the little girl’s preschool. He made a promise to finance her full private school education up to college, which is about as happily ever after as this age permits.

Fairy tale princesses, however, are not bludgeoned to death by their mothers. They are not violated with a tooth brush and a hair brush, and the neighbors do not hear them moaning and pleading at night. Last week, two months before her seventh birthday, Elisa Izquierdo lay in her casket, wearing a crown of flowers. The casket was open, which was an anguished protest on someone’s part; no exertion of the undertaker’s art could conceal all Elisa’s wounds. Before she smashed her daughter’s head against a cement wall, Awilda Lopez told police, she had made her eat her own feces and used her head to mop the floor. All this over a period of weeks, or maybe months. The fairy tale was ended.

This is a story of desperation and a story of one murder. Twenty-three thousand people are murdered in this country every year. This little 6-year-old girl is one, murdered by her mother. But let me read some of the description of what the girl went through. The reason I am describing this is that we failed, the system failed, the child welfare agency failed, and the programs failed to help this girl.

"Drugs, drugs, drugs—that's all she was interested in," says neighbor Doris Sepulveda, who watched the Lopezes trying to sell a child's tricycle outside their building. Another neighbor, Eric Latorre, recalls seeing the whole family out at 2 a.m. as Awilda [the mother] sought crack. . . . [Her mother] reportedly had come to believe that little Elisa, whom she called a mongoloid and a filthy little whore, had been put under a spell by her father—a spell that had to be beaten out of the child. Neighbors, some of whom say they called the authorities, later told the press of muffled moaning and Elisa's voice pleading, "Mommy, mommy, please stop! No more! No more! I'm sorry!" Law-enforcement authorities have provided a reason for those cries: they say Elisa was repeatedly sexually assaulted with a toothbrush and a hairbrush. When her screams became too loud, [her mother] simply turned up the radio.

Elisa stopped attending school, and neighbors say they saw less and less of her. On November 15, Carlos Lopez was jailed again for violating his parole agreement. On November 22, the day before Thanksgiving, all that was twisted in Awilda apparently snapped. One of her sisters, quoted in the New York Times, reported a chilling phone conversation with her that night: "She told me that Elisa was like retarded on the bed, not eating or drinking or going to the bathroom. I said, 'Take her to the hospital, and I'll take care of your other kids.' She said she would think about it after she finished the dishes."

The next morning Awilda called Francisco Santana, a downstairs neighbor. "She was crying, 'I can't believe it, tell me it's not true,'" he says. When he arrived at her apartment, she showed him Elisa's motionless body. He put his hand to the child's cold forehead, pronounced her dead and spent the next two hours pleading with Awilda to call the police. When he finally called himself, he says, she ran to the apartment roof and had to be restrained from jumping. When the police arrived, she confessed to killing Elisa by throwing her against the concrete wall. She confessed that she had made Elisa eat her own feces and that she had mopped the floor with her head. The police told reporters that there was no part of the six-year-old's body that was not cut or bruised. Thirty circular marks that at first appeared to be cigarette burns turned out to be impressions left by the stone in someone's ring. "In my 22 years," says Lieutenant Luis Gonzalez, [the police lieutenant], "this is the worst case of child abuse I have ever seen."

. . . an aspect of the tragedy's aftermath [according to this magazine article] . . . has also dumbfounded the [people of New York who shared in this tragedy]. The people of New York could do nothing about Awilda's drug-induced delusions or her timid neighbors. But they wanted an accounting from the CWA [Child Welfare Agency].

This story describes report after report after report that was made to the Child Welfare Agency.

Instead, Executive Deputy Commissioner [of the Child Welfare Agency] Kathryn Croft has steadfastly maintained that the state

confidentiality laws designed to protect complainants prevent her from revealing any details of the case. Thus the public may never know how many cries for help the agency actually recorded or what it did about them. It may never know whether the CWA really made an extended effort to observe Awilda before [returning that child to this mother].

Mr. President, I have not read all of this article, but it is sufficient to describe what happens to some children in this country. I described several of them yesterday. This is another, a little 6-year-old girl from New York who was failed by our system.

I am investigating at the moment to find out why a child welfare agency would not be willing to disclose what exists in these files. Who contacted them? When did they contact them? Who failed this child? Who did not follow up? Why did they not take this child away from a mother who was torturing her? Why is this child dead?

Confidentiality laws apply to protect people from disclosure of sensitive information about a family that is dealt with by the child welfare agency. It is not a confidentiality statute designed to protect the agency from an investigation. I am trying to find out what kind of Federal circumstances exist that can pry open the child welfare agency's records to find out, how did this happen?

At the end of this story, it describes again a common problem. It describes city, State, and Federal Government budgets that have cut one-sixth from the child welfare agency's budget. The head of the child welfare agency estimates that her caseworkers' caseload is going up. They simply cannot do enough investigations.

It is what I described yesterday. The caseload on the reservation in North Dakota was so high that the social worker who was in charge of those cases put Tamara DeMaris, a young and innocent 3-year-old girl, in a home where she was beaten severely, in a foster home that was not safe. Here, we have a caseload apparently that does not permit a welfare agency to deal with issues of life or death for 6-year-old girls in New York City.

There is something fundamentally wrong. The reason I bring this to the floor is because we are talking about all of these spending areas, all of these areas of Federal spending, and we get phone calls and my colleagues get phone calls saying we have got to cut Federal spending. I do not disagree with that. We have to balance the budget. I do not disagree with that.

Does anybody in this Chamber under any circumstances, or any anybody in any State legislature or in any city council, believe that a 6-year-old does not deserve the protection that society must give her when she is being sexually abused and beaten, and, yes, threatened with murder? Does anybody believe that is not our responsibility?

This country fails these children when we do not decide to debate these kinds of issues in the context of what

we must do to protect these kids? It is not a question of anybody that thinks it does not matter or whether you have enough social workers to protect these children. In my judgment, we are not doing any service to public service in this country. We must, it seems to me, ask the question: How do we do this job? Not whether, but how do we do this job? What does it take to make sure we protect these children?

I hope everyone reads this article. There are dozens and dozens and dozens of cases like this all over the country. My only point is, we can do much better and must do much better. When systems fail, we must find out why. When children, innocent victims, find themselves in circumstances like this, someone ought to be willing to stand up and assume responsibility, to say we are going to help.

I told the Senate yesterday about a stack of folders on a floor, where I saw reports of sexual and physical abuse against children on an Indian reservation that had not even been investigated because they did not have the investigators to go out and investigate. I was appalled, just appalled to understand that in that stack is a young child living in a circumstance where they have been sexually molested. There is an allegation of sexual misconduct or allegation of physical misconduct by a guardian, and it has not even been investigated. We must do better than that.

I hope that as we discuss and think our way through this notion of how do we balance the budget, we ask, what are our priorities? Is it B-2 bombers, is it the school lunch program, is it a dozen or 100 different things? I hope none of us will ever decide that it is discretionary on our part whether we protect children like Elisa.

Elisa did not have to die. We failed. We all failed Elisa, and I hope as we develop our priorities for the years ahead, we will decide, at the very least, that those who cannot help themselves, those children in harm's way, those children whose lives are threatened deserve and require our help. I hope there is no disagreement on any side of the political aisle on that question.

I recognize the Senator from Minnesota has been waiting. I appreciate very much his indulgence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I referred in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time, Dec. 11, 1995]

ABANDONED TO HER FATE

(By David Van Biema)

Elisa Izquierdo liked to dance, which is almost too perfect. Fairy tales, especially those featuring princesses, often include dancing, although perhaps not Elisa's favorite merengue. Fairy-tale princesses are born humble. Elisa fit that bill: she was conceived in a homeless shelter in the Fort Greene section of Brooklyn and born addicted to crack.

That Elisa nevertheless had a special, enchanted aura is something the whole city of New York now knows. "Radiant," says one of her preschool teachers, remembering a brilliant smile and flashing black eyes. "People loved her," adds another. "Everybody loved her." And, unlikely as it may seem, there was even a prince in Elisa's life: a real scion of Greece's old royalty named Prince Michael, who was a patron of the little girl's preschool. He made a promise to finance her full private-school education up to college, which is about as happily ever after as this age permits.

Fairy-tale princesses, however, are not bludgeoned to death by their mothers. They are not violated with a toothbrush and a hairbrush, and the neighbors do not hear them moaning and pleading at night. Last week, two months before her seventh birthday, Elisa Izquierdo lay in her casket, wearing a crown of flowers. The casket was open, which was an anguished protest on someone's part; no exertion of the undertaker's art could conceal all Elisa's wounds. Before she smashed her daughter's head against a cement wall, Awilda Lopez told police, she had made her eat her own feces and used her head to mop the floor. All this over a period of weeks, or maybe months. The fairy tale was ended.

America dotes on fairy tales and likes to think it takes action on nightmares. When the story of Elisa's death hit the news last week, New Yorkers and people across the country remembered the Kitty Genovese murder in 1964, and took to task all the neighbors who had known too much and said nothing. But, it turned out, many others had not been silent: Elisa's slow, tortured demise had been reported repeatedly. Over the six years of her life, city authorities had been notified at least eight times. And so outrage focused on the child-welfare system. How did it happen, the public wondered angrily, that Elisa's case was known to the system, and yet the system so shamefully failed her?

The Child Welfare Administration, which handles cases of abuse in New York City, first heard of Elisa on Feb. 11, 1989, the day of her birth. Her mother was a crack addict whose addition was indirectly responsible for her pregnancy: she had lost her apartment, and in Brooklyn's Auburn Place homeless shelter she began a romance with Gustavo Izquierdo, who worked at the shelter as a cook. As her pregnancy progressed, Awilda was so lost in the pipe that relatives managed to wrest custody of her first two children, Rubencito and Kasey, from her. The social workers at Woodhull Hospital took one look at Elisa's tiny, crack-addicted body and immediately assigned custody to the father. Following standard procedure, they also alerted the CWA.

Perhaps to his own surprise, Izquierdo—who had emigrated from Cuba hoping to teach dance—turned out to be a wonderful father. At first there were panicky calls to female acquaintances about diapers and formula, but eventually he mastered the basics. Every morning he would iron a dress for Elisa and put her beautiful hair into braids or pigtails. When she was four, he rented a Queens banquet hall for a party marking her baptism. Says a friend, Mary Crespo: "She was his life. He would always say Elisa was his princess."

It was through her father's efforts that the princess found her prince. Izquierdo took parenting classes at the local YWCA, and he enrolled one-year-old Elisa in the Y's Montessori preschool. She was a favorite pupil. Says the school's then director, Phyllis Bryce: "She was beautiful, radiant. She had an inner strength and a lot of potential for growth." So fond of both father and daughter were the Montessori staff members that

when Izquierdo fell behind on tuition, they recommended his daughter to Prince Michael of Greece.

Michael will probably never ascend his country's throne, since the monarchy was abolished in 1974. But he still dispenses royal charity. After an aide established a connection with the Montessori school, the faculty introduced Michael to Elisa. On the day he arrived in Brooklyn, he would later remember, "[Elisa] jumped into my arms. She was a lively, charming, beautiful girl. She was so full of love." The prince visited several times, bringing stuffed animals or clothes; the little princess responded with thank-you notes and pictures. Michael's most handsome offer arrived in late 1993: he would pay Elisa's full tuition, through 12th grade, at the Brooklyn Friends School.

In 1991 Awilda petitioned for, and was granted, unsupervised visitation rights with her daughter. The mother had already regained custody of her two older children; she seemed to have effected a miraculous recovery. In December 1990 social workers signed an affidavit stating that she had given up drugs, married a man named Carlos Lopez and settled at a permanent address. "Both [Lopez] are willing to go for random drug tests," the affidavit read. "They never miss appointments with the agency, and they are always on time. Mr. Lopez is supportive. . . . He appears to be gentle and understanding."

That last was a grave misjudgment. Carlos Lopez, who did maintenance work, was solicitous only in public. At night neighbors heard dishes, pots and pans crashing against walls. In January 1992, a month after Awilda gave birth to his second child, Carlos stabbed her 17 times with a pocketknife, putting her in the hospital for three days. According to a neighbor, the attack occurred in front of Elisa, during a weekend visit. Carlos served two months in jail and then, neighbors say, resumed beating his wife—and his visiting stepdaughter.

Elisa's life became an excruciating alternation of happiness and horror. The four-year-old took the Friends School's screening examination and passed. But according to Montessori teacher Barbara Simmons, she also began telling people that her mother had locked her in a closet. On one occasion she volunteered, "Awilda hits me. I don't want to go to Awilda." Montessori principal Bryce says she reported suspected abuse to both the Brooklyn Bureau of Community Services and a child-abuse hot line—the CWA's second warning about Elisa. In response, Bryce has said, child-welfare workers made several visits to the Lopez home, "and then stopped, as they usually do."

Izquierdo apparently knew about the mistreatment. A neighbor told the New York Times that Elisa would wake up screaming in the night, that although toilet trained, she had begun to urinate and defecate uncontrollably and that there were cuts and bruises on her vagina. In 1992 Izquierdo petitioned the family court to deny Awilda custodial rights, but fate intervened before the court could act on his request. By late 1993, already ill with cancer, he was planning to take Elisa to Cuba, and perhaps hoping to leave here permanently. Tickets were bought, but he became too ill to travel and on May 26 Izquierdo died.

Awilda immediately filed for permanent custody. A cousin of Izquierdo's, Elsa Canizares, challenged the petition, alleging that Lopez was insane and abused the child. Bryce wrote in a letter to family court judge Phoebe Greenbaum that "Elisa was emotionally and physically abused during the weekend visitations with her mom. Teachers' observation notes are available." Bryce also enlisted the help of Prince Michael, who added his own letter.

Canizares arrived for the June 1994 custody hearing alone. Awilda, by contrast, brought a small army. Her lawyer that day was from the Legal Aid Society, which maintained that its caseworkers had visited the Lopezes and found that "Elisa expressed a strong desire to live with her mother" and her siblings. Also backing Awilda was the CWA, which Judge Greenbaum has indicated had been monitoring the family for more than a year—the agency's third contact with Elisa. Finally there was Project Chance, a federally funded parenting program for the poor run by a man named Bart O'Connor.

When O'Connor met her in 1992, Awilda had seemed "an easily excitable woman," but one who was "very lively, very vibrant and loved her children beyond belief." She dutifully attended parenting classes and sought extra advice. There were setbacks, during which she returned to drugs and abandoned the children. But she recovered—"The kids seemed happy, and the house was immaculate." When Awilda asked O'Connor to help her get Elis back, he had his doubts: "She was just learning to handle five kids. I thought another kid might be too much." But, after all, he had just given her a progress award, so he vouched for her to the court. In September Judge Greenbaum awarded full custody to Awilda, directing the CWA to observe the family for a year. Last week, hounded by the press, Greenbaum released a statement that read in part, "It is any judge's worst nightmare to be involved in a case in which a child dies."

Especially, it can be assumed, when a child dies slowly, by torture. In September, Awilda removed Elisa from the Montessori school and enrolled her in Manhattan's Public School 26. The *Daily News* reports that on arrival, she seemed a fairly happy girl, one who shared make-believe bus trips with other children during lunch hour. But she soon folded up into herself. The school's principal and social worker, noting that she was often bruised and had trouble walking, reported the matter directly to a deputy director of CWA's Manhattan field division, in what would be CWA's fourth notification. School district spokesman Andrew Lachman says the official allegedly replied that the case was "not reportable" owing to insufficient evidence. School staff then visited the Lopez apartment. To their surprise, Awilda "was very happy to see them," says Lachman, and there were no signs of abuse.

O'Connor, however, was regretting his recommendation to the judge. He received a series of hysterical phone calls from Awilda complaining that Elisa was soiling herself and drinking from the toilet and had cut off her hair. Finally she asked O'Connor to take Elisa away. Convinced the girl's symptoms had existed prior to her contact with Awilda but were now driving her mother over the edge, he rushed to the apartment. "You could smell urine and see she had defecated everywhere," he says. "Her toys were thrown around. There were feces smeared on the refrigerator."

O'Connor claims he called Elisa's CWA caseworker, who told him he was "too busy" to come by. Moreover, O'Connor says the caseworker never responded to this fifth appeal to CWA, despite repeated subsequent calls. O'Connor took the Lopezes to a city hospital for psychiatric counseling, and Awilda seemed to calm down somewhat. To O'Connor's dismay however, she repeatedly avoided signing a release that would allow him to send his observations to the city agency. By last July she had dropped out of touch entirely.

There was a reason for that. "Drugs, drugs, drugs—that's all she was interested in," says neighbor Doris Sepulveda, who watched the Lopezes trying to sell a child's tricycle outside their building. Another neighbor, Eric

Latorre, recalls seeing the whole family out at 2 a.m. as Awilda sought crack. Awilda had reportedly come to believe that Elisa, whom she called a mongoloid and filthy little whore, had been put under a spell by her father—a spell that had to be beaten out of the child. Neighbors, some of whom say they called the authorities, later told the press of muffled moaning and Elisa's voice pleading, "Mommy, Mommy, please stop! No more! No more! I'm sorry!" Law-enforcement authorities have provided a reason for those cries: they say Elisa was repeatedly sexually assaulted with a toothbrush and a hairbrush. When her screams became too loud, Awilda turned up the radio.

Elisa stopped attending school, and neighbors say they saw less and less of her. On Nov. 15, Carlos Lopez was jailed again for violating his parole agreement. And on Nov. 22, the day before Thanksgiving, all that was twisted in Awilda apparently snapped. One of her sisters, quoted in the New York Times, reported a chilling phone conversation with her that night: "She told me that Elisa was like retarded on the bed, not eating or drinking or going to the bathroom. I said, 'Take her to the hospital, and I'll take care of your other kids.' She said she would think about it after she finished the dishes."

The next morning Awilda called Francisco Santana, a downstairs neighbor. "She was crying. 'I can't believe it, tell me it's not true,'" he says. When he arrived at her apartment, she showed him Elisa's motionless body. He put his hand to the child's cold forehead, pronounced her dead and spent the next two hours pleading with Awilda to call the police. When he finally called himself, he says, she ran to the apartment roof and had to be restrained from jumping. When the police arrived, she confessed to killing Elisa by throwing her against a concrete wall. She confessed that she had made Elisa eat her own feces and that she had mopped the floor with her head. The police told reporters that there was no part of the six-year-old's body that was not cut or bruised. Thirty circular marks that at first appeared to be cigarette burns turned out to be impressions left by the stone in someone's ring. "In my 22 years," said Lieut. Luis Gonzalez, "this is the worst case of child abuse I have ever seen."

O'Connor sits in his Brooklyn office and fields calls from the media. "We made a mistake," he says grimly. "We will try to make sure this never happens again." Looking back, he says, "I should have thrown bombs in the CWA's doorway." The initials themselves infuriate him. At least, he says, "we will say our mea culpa. We're not going to run behind confidentiality laws and not admit we've made a mistake."

He is referring to an aspect of the tragedy's aftermath that has dumbfounded the city. The people of New York could do nothing about Awilda's drug-induced delusions or her timid neighbors. But they wanted an accounting from the CWA. Instead, Executive Deputy Commissioner Kathryn Croft has steadfastly maintained that state confidentiality laws designed to protect complainants prevent her from revealing any details of a case. Thus the public may never know how many cries for help the agency actually recorded or what it did about them. It may never know whether the CWA really made an extended effort to observe Awilda before making a recommendation to Judge Greenbaum—or whether a caseworker was really "too busy" to return a call.

What the public could surmise, however, was that something was amiss. Last week someone leaked an Oct. 10 letter from CWA Commissioner Croft to Mayor Rudolph Guiliani, complaining that city staff cuts make it impossible for her to train child-

abuse caseworkers or even measure their competence. And that is the least of it. The city, state and Federal Government have cut one-sixth from CWA's \$1.2 billion budget. While Croft estimates her average staff member's case load at 16.9, some workers at the agency's Queens branch put theirs at 25, a number that almost precludes meaningful long-term investigations. "There are no bodies available to do the work," says Bonnie Buford, a supervisor in a Queens child-protective-services unit. Claims Gail Nayowith, executive director of the Citizens' Committee for Children: "Case loads are rising. Investigations take longer, and some very important programs don't exist . . . This child and her family should have got services. With appropriate interventions, services and follow-up, [Elisa] would be alive."

But she is not alive. At her funeral, the Rev. Gianni Agostinelli told mourners that "Elisa was not killed only by the hand of a sick individual, but by the impotence of silence of many, by the neglect of child-welfare institutions and the moral mediocrity that has intoxicated our neighborhoods." Later, Elisa was laid to rest in the Cypress Hills Cemetery in Queens. There had been discussion about her body: the Izquierdo side of her family wanted to determine its fate, but so did the Lopez side. And it seems that mortuaries, like city bureaucracies, have rules for such situations. Regardless of the circumstances, the custody of the body goes to the mother.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

THE CBO IS NOT SANTA CLAUS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit this afternoon about budget numbers and budget dollars.

To hear the talk on Capitol Hill, you would think that Christmas came early this week and that the Congressional Budget Office was playing the part of Santa Claus, because on Monday, the CBO released its revised revenue predictions for the next 7 years, producing an unexpected \$135 billion windfall over the life of our 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget.

And would you not know it, like kids let loose under a package-packed Christmas tree, President Clinton and Congress are scrambling to snatch up the dollars for their own holiday spending spree.

Mr. President, I did not come to the floor to be the Grinch Who Stole Christmas, but let's take a step back and ask ourselves just what we're doing here. We've got a deficit today of \$164 billion and a national debt of nearly \$5 trillion.

We are dangerously overextended on the Government's credit card. Yet when the revenue forecast says we will have \$135 billion more than we thought we would have by the year 2002, what are we thinking when the first thing we want to do is rush out and squander it on a taxpayer financed holiday spending spree?

If that is how this Congress is going to conduct itself, we are no better than the 40 years of past Congresses that got us into this fiscal mess to begin with.

Where is the commitment to changing Washington's free-spending ways

we like to brag about to our constituents back home? What kind of message does this send to the taxpayers, who entrusted their dollars—their hard-earned tax dollars—to us in the first place?

Anybody can spend a dollar, Mr. President, or in the case of Congress, a great, great many of them. But it takes discipline to save those same dollars, and what I am seeing today is a disturbing lack of the kind of discipline it will take to finally balance the budget.

What should we do with the \$135 billion found by the CBO? Exactly what legislation introduced last week by myself and my good friend, Senator McCain, instructs us to do: lock it away on behalf of the taxpayers for deficit reduction or additional tax relief.

The Taxpayer Protection Lockbox Act of 1995 precisely spells out the process Congress must undertake when actual Federal revenues exceed predictions. Our legislation ends the abuse of taxpayer dollars and returns honesty to the budget process by creating a new revenue lockbox.

As we all know, Congress acknowledges the CBO as Government's voice of authority when it comes to accurate, conservative, nonpartisan economic projections.

Congress relies on those CBO projections when we estimate the amount of tax revenues that will come into the Treasury over the life of our 7-year balanced budget plan, and then we use those revenue estimates to determine the extent to which Federal spending can grow without resulting in a budget deficit in the year 2002.

While these estimates by the Congressional Budget Office are generally on the mark, they are only estimates, of course, and the revised forecast issued by the CBO this week illustrates the inherent problem with forecasts: Changing conditions mean forecasts need to be updated.

And as we move closer to a balanced budget, they will need further updating to take into account the additional dollars our balanced budget plan will generate for the Treasury. After all, we are including tax relief designed to stimulate economic growth, create new jobs, and turn tax users into productive taxpayers.

Any additional dollars, however, should not be used to feed Congress' appetite for spending. Instead, any additional revenue that results from our balanced budget plan ought to be returned to the taxpayers in the form of tax relief or deficit reduction.

These dollars were born of the hard work and productivity of the American people—it makes sense to give those dollars back to the taxpayers and encourage even greater productivity.

And that is just what our revenue lockbox does. It requires that any revenues above and beyond current estimates be used for tax cuts and/or deficit reduction.

It ensures taxpayers that their hard-earned dollars will no longer be automatically spent by Congress, ending